

# CRIMINAL JUSTICE TREND DATA FOOTNOTES

## **Tables 1 and 1A: REPORTED CRIMES AND CLEARANCES**

In 2003, larceny-theft over \$400 was included in the property crime category to give a more representative depiction of crime in California. The 2000 through 2002 property crime totals and crime rates have been adjusted to reflect this change. Therefore, the data tables in this report may appear inconsistent with previously reported data.

The Uniform Crime Reporting Program does not collect data regarding crime clearances for larceny-theft according to dollar values.

A crime rate describes the number of crimes reported to law enforcement agencies per 100,000 total population.

A clearance rate is the percentage of clearances based on the total crimes reported.

Prior to 2005, the Los Angeles Police Department included child abuse and spouse abuse simple assault in the aggravated assault category. This change may have contributed to the large decrease in aggravated assaults from 2004 to 2005.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified that crime was underreported in its jurisdiction from 2000 to 2002. Therefore, caution should be exercised when using data for this jurisdiction and time frame.

## **Table 2: SUPPLEMENTAL DETAIL FOR SELECTED REPORTED CRIMES**

In May 2004, the Sacramento Police Department discovered that, while its larceny-theft totals were accurate, information about the nature of larcenies reported was sometimes inaccurate. For instance, the February through October 2004 information regarding purse-snatching, shoplifting, and pocket-picking was captured under the "all other" category instead of being reported in separate categories. The department has corrected the problem with its records management system, and the reports for November and December 2004 contain accurate information.

The Torrance Police Department estimated its 2002 supplemental crime data. Additionally, the department did not provide stolen property values for 2002 through 2004 because of a problem with its records management system.

Larceny-theft dollar amounts are estimated values of property stolen.

## **Tables 3A, 3B, and 3C: FELONY ARRESTS**

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified that crime was underreported in its jurisdiction from 2000 to 2002. Therefore, caution should be exercised when using data for this jurisdiction and time frame.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

## **Tables 4A, 4B, and 4C: MISDEMEANOR ARRESTS**

Misdemeanor burglary became a CJS codeable offense in 2001.

In June 2005, infraction offenses were no longer recorded in the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system. Previously, these offenses were optional to report and classified as miscellaneous misdemeanor traffic violations.

"Status offenses" include truancy, incorrigibility, running away, and curfew violations. These offenses are only committed or engaged in by a juvenile.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified that crime was underreported in its jurisdiction from 2000 to 2002. Therefore, caution should be exercised when using data for this jurisdiction and time frame.

## **Table 5: TOTAL LAW ENFORCEMENT DISPOSITIONS**

This section reflects the law enforcement agency disposition of the arrest offense, not of the person arrested. This disposition is by law enforcement and not at the level of the district attorney or court.

"To Other Agency" refers to an arrest made on another law enforcement agency's warrant, with no local charges, and the subject is being held for the other agency.

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE TREND DATA FOOTNOTES *(continued)*

"Released" is an arrest offense released under Penal Code section 849(b). The arresting agency plans no further action on the arrest offense.

"Complaints Sought" refers to an adult arrestee being turned over to the district attorney for action.

"Within Dept." refers to a juvenile taken into custody for committing a violation and the law enforcement agency does not make a referral to juvenile court and does not file formal charges. The juvenile, in most cases, is warned and released to the parents or guardian.

"Juvenile Probation" refers to juveniles arrested and referred to the probation department or juvenile court.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified that crime was underreported in its jurisdiction from 2000 to 2002. Therefore, caution should be exercised when using data for this jurisdiction and time frame.

### **Tables 6 and 6A: DISPOSITIONS OF ADULT FELONY ARRESTS**

Adult felony arrest disposition data are extracted directly from the Automated Criminal History System (ACHS) and converted into an Offender-Based Transaction Statistics (OBTS) report file. This report uses data compiled from this report file. However, because of a document processing backlog and programming problems, the date of data extraction has varied throughout the years. The 2000 OBTS final file was created in January 2002; the 2001 file in January 2003; the 2002 file in May 2004; the 2003 file in October 2004; the 2004 file in January 2006; the 2005 file in April 2006; the 2006 file in April 2007; the 2007 file in April 2008; the 2008 file in April 2009; and the 2009 file in March 2010.

Dispositions of adult felony arrests in state correctional institutions, while included in statewide totals, are excluded from county-level totals.

"Other" includes no sentence given, sentence suspended, and sentence stayed.

From 2000 to 2002, Alameda County underreported final dispositions. This error is attributed to a programming problem discovered in 2002.

Contra Costa County did not provide disposition data for May through December 2008.

In the fall of 2001, Los Angeles County informed the CJSJ that it had not sent the DOJ 127 tapes containing records of approximately 2,000 dispositions per tape from 2000 through 2001. The 2000 OBTS file was not reopened to accommodate the unreported dispositions.

Sacramento County's 2008 disposition information is incomplete and should not be compared to earlier years.

San Bernardino County attributed the decrease in dispositions from 2000 through 2001 to the county's decision to discontinue the manual reporting process before implementing a new tape reporting system.

San Diego County's decrease in dispositions from 2001 through 2006 may be due to a reporting error. The agency reported dispositions as subsequent actions rather than final dispositions.

The San Francisco Police Department reports few law enforcement releases and relies on the District Attorney's Office to make release determinations.

San Francisco County's 2004 disposition data may contain material errors resulting from the county's data coding practices. Therefore, the San Francisco City and County criminal justice agencies are working with the DOJ to review the data and remedy suspected errors. Any questions should be directed to the San Francisco Court Management System Coordinator's Office at (415) 553-1267. Also, the 2005 disposition information for San Francisco County is incomplete.

In 2002, because of a programming problem San Joaquin County reported a reversal in the number of probation sentences versus probation and jail sentences given.

The decrease in Ventura County's dispositions from 2000 through 2001 is attributed to technical difficulties associated with the county's automated tape disposition reporting.

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE TREND DATA FOOTNOTES *(continued)*

### **Table 7: ADULT PROBATION**

The source of this information is the monthly summary data reports submitted by county probation departments.

These data include information about adults placed on supervised probation as of December 31 of each year. Data regarding court probation, diversion, and summary probation are not included in this report.

"Other" includes transfers of jurisdiction from one county to another, death, sentence vacated, successful appeal, and deportation.

The 2000 through 2007 data for adults removed from felony offense probation will not match previously reported data because of programmatic adjustments made to Alameda County. These adjustments also affected statewide removal counts.

The numbers of adult probation caseloads in Santa Barbara County were corrected for 2007 and will not match previously reported data.

In 2005, Ventura County adjusted its 2003 and 2004 adult probation files. Therefore, data for Ventura County and statewide does not match previously reported data.

Contra Costa, Merced, Sacramento, Siskiyou, Tulare, and Yolo county probation departments did not report separate misdemeanor offense counts.

### **Table 8: JAIL PROFILE SURVEY**

The source for jail population data is the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA, formerly the California Board of Corrections), "Jail Profile Survey."

Average daily jail population is defined as the average number of inmates housed in a local facility per day. The number includes inmates housed in single or double cells, dormitories, disabled housing, and disciplinary or administrative segregation. The values reported are based upon each facility's "early morning" count.

The CSA collects inmate data from Type I facilities annually at the close of

the fiscal year (June 30). Prior to FY 2000/2001, the inmate data were for the first quarter of each fiscal year (July through September). Therefore, the FY 2000/2001 inmate data may not be comparable to prior years because of these changes in the CSA's reporting procedure.

The average daily number of inmates for Type II, III, and IV facilities is for July through September.

In this report, jail counts may not add to the total because of projections and rounding of numbers made by the CSA.

### **Table 9: CRIMINAL JUSTICE FULL-TIME PERSONNEL**

Law enforcement personnel counts are obtained through a one-day survey taken on October 31 of each reporting year. Other personnel counts are taken on June 30.

In 2004, Exeter, King City, Sonoma, and CSU Monterey Bay police departments did not submit law enforcement personnel data.

Mendota Police Department began reporting data in September 2009.

The Tehachapi Police Department began reporting data in January 2009.

Prosecution, public defense, and probation department counts reflect all full-time personnel, regardless of the funding source.

Assembly Bill 196 (Kuehl, 1999) mandated that county-level child support programs previously administered by district attorneys must be operated by local child support agencies. This change accounts for the large decrease in prosecution personnel since 2001.

The Alameda County Public Defender did not report data for 2009.

The Lassen County Public Defender did not report data for 2001.

For 2003, the Alameda County Probation Department reported the number of positions, rather than reporting the number of actual employees. Also, that department did not report data for 2000.

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE TREND DATA FOOTNOTES *(continued)*

Prior to 2006, the Fresno County Probation Department incorrectly listed its correctional officers under the "All other" category.

The Marin County Probation Department did not report data for 2002.

The San Francisco County Probation Department did not report data for 2004.

"Auxiliary" includes court commissioners and referees.

On July 1, 2005, all agencies that previously reported to the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency consolidated their programs into the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Because of their consolidation, the personnel data can no longer be separated in a comparable manner to what the CJSC has previously reported for these agencies. The CDCR personnel counts are for the fiscal year and are obtained from the State of California Governor's Budget report.

Personnel data for the DOJ and state regulatory agencies are not included in this report.

Inconsistencies in data from year to year may be attributed to individual agency interpretations of personnel classifications.

Personnel data for state agencies are shown in the statewide Criminal Justice Profile report.

Counts may not match previously reported data because of changes in categories and/or file adjustments.

### **Table 10: CRIMINAL JUSTICE EXPENDITURES**

Expenditure data for FY 2008/2009 were not available from the Office of the State Controller in time for inclusion in this report.

Expenditure data are based on a fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) and include salaries, employee benefits, services, and supplies. Building construction and capital expenditures are not included in expenditure data.

State agencies' expenditure data are presented in the statewide Criminal Justice Profile report.

Expenditure data for the DOJ and other regulatory agencies are not included in this report.

As of July 1, 2005, all agencies that previously reported to the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency consolidated their programs into the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).

A negative expenditure value reported by a county is shown as zero in this report.

All expenditures have been rounded and are shown in thousands.

The San Francisco County expenditure data are reported by the City and County of San Francisco, Office of the Controller.

### **NOTES:**

- Crime and arrest rates are calculated using the annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance. Beginning in 2004, population estimates are based on the 2000 Census. Population estimates for 2000 through 2003 are based on the 1990 Census. Readers are advised to exercise caution in interpreting changes in percent and rate between decennial census samples.
- Rates are not calculated when a county's population is less than 100,000 in a given year.
- Rates may not add to subtotals or total because of rounding.
- Percentages may not total 100.0 because of rounding.
- With the exception of clearance rates (Table 1A), percent distributions are not calculated when the total number upon which those percentages are based is less than 50.
- See the Data Characteristics and Known Limitations for additional information.